



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

M. Martroye's use of the sources is in general convincing, although his conclusions in some cases will be questioned. In the matter of the conscious policy which he attributes to Genseric the reader will feel that his theory, plausible and likely as it may be, is not completely established. He gives perhaps too much space to the miracles and marvels related by religious writers and to what in one instance he terms the "récits romanesques" of such chroniclers as Procopius and Jordanes, but these serve to enliven the narrative and do not seriously detract from its sober quality.

E. H. MCNEAL.

## BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*Dramatic Traditions of the Dark Ages.* By JOSEPH S. TUNISON. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1907. Pp. xviii, 350.)

THE object of this book is to show that the Greek theatre existed in the Byzantine Empire throughout the Middle Ages and influenced the development in western Europe of both the medieval and the modern drama. As evidence the author cites literary productions, notices of persons and things theatrical, and practices in church and in social life. To connect the medieval and the modern drama with the unbroken Greek tradition, he tries to show that, when the medieval drama originated and when it was transformed into the modern, influence from Greece was actually present as a shaping force.

The book is very irritating, but very interesting and useful. It is interesting and useful, because it calls attention to many forgotten or only half-regarded features of Byzantine civilization in literature, in social life, and in the church. It is irritating, because the reader too often feels that, in order to reach sound conclusions, he must himself repeat Mr. Tunison's investigations. Dates are rarely given, though in such a discussion they are often essential; statements of fact fundamental to the discussion are often made without presentation of the evidence; the author too often uses evidence that has been discredited by recent research and too often makes unjustifiable inferences. The space allotted for this review permits only a few of the most flagrant examples.

On page eighty Eudocia (393-460) is cited as authority for comedy and the comedian Dexippus. In all the extant writings by this Eudocia (ed. Ludwich, Teubner texts), there is nothing of this nature. Apparently she is confused with another Eudocia (eleventh century), the putative author of the *Violarium*, a biographical dictionary now known to have been compiled about 1543. In the standard text of this (J. Flach, Teubner texts), section 309 is devoted to the comic writer Dioxippus (the older texts have Dexippus), and four of his comedies are mentioned.

Perhaps the most remarkable instances of uncritical procedure are connected with the attempt to ascribe the beginnings of the medieval

drama to Greek influence (pp. 161-181). Roswitha (Hrotsvit), as is well known, wrote a number of poems and six plays based on religious legends. She says she was induced to write her plays by reading the plays of Terence and blushing at their immorality. Mr. Tunison thinks that Greek influence at the Saxon court in the person of Theophano, wife of Otto II., is to be taken into account, and that Roswitha learned her dramatic technique from Theophano herself. No reason is assigned for rejecting Roswitha's statement, for her failure to mention her obligations to a lady of so great rank, or for the curious coincidence in number between her plays and those of Terence. The case for Greek influence is supported by very ingenious arguments. On page 164 we read: "But Roswitha took an unusual step for her time when she turned for materials [for her poems] to the synaxaries of the Greek church. The life of St. Pelagius, the histories of St. Proterius, St. Blasius, and St. Dionysius, the martyrdom of St. Agnes, the conversion of St. Theophilus, were for the most part material quite fresh in her time." As St. Blasius is nowhere mentioned by Roswitha, his name is doubtless a misprint for St. Basilus. Proterius, associated with him in the legend, is not the saint of that name; and the Theophilus mentioned is not St. Theophilus, but the well-known medieval counterpart of Faust. St. Agnes is a Roman saint and the scene of her martyrdom was Rome. St. Dionysius is the famous apostle to France and first bishop of Paris. As to St. Pelagius of Cordova, Roswitha says that she got his story from a citizen of Cordova. On page 165 we are told that Bodo the historian of Gandersheim says Roswitha knew Greek. So he does, but to weigh his testimony duly it is necessary to remember that he wrote some five hundred years after her death. On page 168 we are instructed that, "it is not impossible that they [the plays] should be mere paraphrases of pieces known to the religious theater of Byzantium". How then shall we account for the fact that they agree not only in general structure, but even in phraseology with Latin versions of the legends? Minor errors in detail also occur. That the play *Sapientia* "is an allegory in the form of a history" would have surprised Roswitha, and that it "might almost be called a masque" will surprise any reader who knows what constitutes a masque. It is surely misleading to say (p. 167) that "competent critics agree that her dramas could be acted as they were written". Some have contended that they could. That *Sapientia* and *Calimachus* could, is hard to believe. The implication of page 167 is that Roswitha's dramatic technique was excellent. Her "correctness" consists, in fact, only in not interpolating such expressions as "inquit" in the dialogue. She follows her legends almost slavishly and neglects the most obvious opportunities for spectacular and dramatic effects; see her treatment of the comic situation in *Dulcitius*, sc. iv, and compare, in *Gallicanus*, I, ix, with I, xii, 7, and, in *Calimachus*, sc. vii, with the report in ix, 13.

Why Mr. Tunison calls the account of the origin of tropes a legend

I do not understand. Notker himself tells us how he was led to compose them. But I am equally at a loss to know why Mr. Tunison regards Notker's master Yso as a "figment" and speaks of him as "supposititious". Is his other master, Marcellus, also a figment, developed from some Greek musical term? Notker himself mentions both with the same apparent good faith, the date of Yso's death is duly recorded in the necrology of St. Gall, and, although legendary elements had possibly crept into the story of his birth by the time Ekkehard IV. wrote, it is clear that he was a real person and that his name was not derived from the Greek term for the basal monotone of a melody, but was probably the vernacular form of Eusebius, his "name-father".

Even in his incidental excursions Mr. Tunison is unfortunate. Whether Guido delle Colonne knew Greek is a matter of little consequence—other men in the Middle Ages certainly did—but apparently he did not, or at least he made no use of his knowledge. Since the appearance of Gorra's *Testi Inediti di Storia Trojana* (1887), scholars have not credited Guido with a knowledge of Dares Phrygius and Dictys Cretensis, to say nothing of Homer. The contents of the *Historia Destructionis Trojae*, even to minute details, are fully accounted for by Benoit de Sainte-More, Virgil, Ovid, and Isidore of Seville.

It is obvious, then, that Mr. Tunison's evidence cannot always be accepted without examination. But the book is, I repeat, distinctly interesting and valuable. It is the work of a scholarly and independent mind; but unfortunately the lack of sound methods produces as strange results in literary history as it used to produce in etymology. In the good old days of unchecked ingenious theorizing it was little trouble to derive an English word from the Hebrew or the Chaldee tongue. We have reformed all that in etymology, but we—not Mr. Tunison only, but professional scholars in some of the highest academic positions in this and other lands—are still pursuing in literary history and other fields of learning the same methods that brought etymology into disrepute. Mr. Tunison, in the scanty leisure of an editorial writer for a daily paper and without ready access to an adequately equipped library, has emphasized for us features in the history of literature and of civilization that have not received due consideration. By its merits no less than by its defects, his book deserves a more elaborate review than space here permits.

JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY.

*Le Royaume de Bourgogne (888-1038)*. Étude sur les Origines du Royaume d'Arles. Par RENÉ POUPARDIN, docteur-ès-lettres. [Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études, Sciences Historiques et Philologiques, fascicule 163.] (Paris: Champion. 1907. Pp. xl, 508.)

AMONG the various areas to which, to the confusion of the historical student, the name of Burgundy has at one time or another been attached,